

**BDAC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION  
WORK GROUP**

**Ecosystem Restoration Work Group  
Meeting Summary  
Wednesday, May 28, 1997**

The thirteenth meeting of the BDAC Ecosystem Restoration Work Group was held on Wednesday, May 28, 1997 in the Resources Building from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 m.

BDAC Members present were:

Mary Selkirk, Chair	Tib Belza	Lee Lehman
Bob Raab		

Invited Participants of the Work Group present were:

Nat Bingham	Gary Bobker	Pete Chadwick
Steve Ford	Rod Fujita	Bruce Herbold
Buford Holt	Jeff Jaraczski	Pete Rhoads
Tom Zuckerman		

CALFED Staff/Consultant Team present were:

Dick Daniel	Jean Elder	Kate Hansel
Jim Martin	Ray McDowell	Bob Pine
Rick Soehren		

Other Participants included:

Lee Barrett	Robert Clark	Dan Craig
Bill Crooks	John A. Gage, Jr.	Michael Gutterres
Linda Hunter	Mae Iadia	Diana Jacobs
Steve Johnson	Roger Masuda	Scott McCreary
Mike McGowan	Hari Modi	Jim Moore
Earl Nelson	Kent Nelson	Vickie Newlin
Rebecca Nieto	Elizabeth Patterson	Jason Peltier
Dennis Pendleton	Nicole Sandkulla	Wayne Sawka
Rick Sitts	Scott Spaulding	Leo Winternitz

**Scientific Review Panel Discussion**

Kate Hansel introduced the proposed membership selection criteria and reviewed the list of potential candidates for panel membership. Participants provided their comments, as follows.

Scientific Review Panel Selection Criteria:

- Ensure that panelists do not work primarily, in the Bay-Delta system to ensure that the deliberations are as objective as possible. They may work for agencies or organizations which do conduct work in the Delta.
- Ensure the panel includes expertise in economics, anthropology and/or sociology to address impacts on human communities and costs. Having a mix of expertise will encourage the panel to integrate human ecology with physical ecology.
- Ensure the panel includes experience in hypothesis testing.
- Retain scientists who have some terrestrial expertise.
- Include synthetic or systems thinkers.
- Ensure panel includes scientists who have expertise in more than one area of restoration and practice a systems approach.

Related recommendations and comments:

- Most IEP scientists work in the Bay-Delta system. The selection criteria will make most IEP scientists ineligible for panel membership. However, those who do not work in the Bay-Delta system may be asked to be on the panel. Those who do work in the system may be included as a technical advisor.
- If the panel is to be convened in July, some scientists may not be available due to prior commitments. Suggestions were made to address this limitation, including: 1) having high level officials in the Department of Interior and the Governor's office extend the invitations; and 2) delaying the convening of the panel to the August through October time frame to allow review of the ERPP prior to the panel discussions.
- It was suggested to conduct the scientific review annually and to incorporate it into the adaptive management process.
- Suggestions were made to prioritize questions and focus first on those that need immediate responses.

Purpose of panel discussions:

- Suggestions were made to focus the panel on aquatic resources, fish, flows, habitat and processes, and the ecological effectiveness of the ERPP.
- It was suggested that stressors be discussed in the context of the adaptive management strategy.

Rather than discuss the list of questions handed out at the meeting, the Group decided to discuss the membership and role of the technical advisory group.

Technical advisory group:

Issues regarding the technical advisors included the selection criteria, stakeholder role in selecting the group and the purpose of the group.

*Selection Criteria:*

- Scientists should have specific knowledge of the Bay-Delta system. The group should be balanced in terms of areas of expertise and stakeholder affiliations.
- Have advanced degrees and experience demonstrated by publications and other works. It was pointed out that limiting the membership to people with advanced degrees may exclude people with applied knowledge of the system.

*Role of the Technical Advisory Group:*

- Scientists will provide local expertise to the scientific review panel and will not advocate for specific points of view. The technical panel can fulfil this role by being interviewed by the scientific review panel and proactively providing knowledge and advice during discussions.
- Members will be required to disclose background and affiliations and work within panel ground rules.

It was clarified that any participant or member of the public is encouraged to recommend scientists for either panel. The work group participants wanted to ensure that the scientific review and technical support panels will reflect a diversity of expertise and that the panelists and workshop will integrate the areas of expertise in panel discussions. Kate Hansel will accept recommendations for membership until Friday, May 30, 1997.

**Discussion of Adaptive Management and Assurances**

Dick Daniel presented a case study focussed on development of an adaptive management program and assurances for restoration of tidal wetlands to provide a context for the discussion. A major question is how to balance the need for adaptive management (flexibility) with the need for assurances (certainty). Discussion comments are provided below.

Issues and standards to consider when designing an adaptive management program:

- Use information gathered from restoration efforts on Holland Tract and Prospect and Liberty Islands.
- The ERPP will need good monitoring reports.
- Ensure achievement of ERPP goals and improve performance of indicators.

- Keep an emphasis that is consistent with the ERPP, i.e., emphasize reducing the number and size of diversions over installing fish screens.
- The ERPP should allow for a phased approach to project implementation, permit streamlining, and linkages between projects.
- The ERPP needs mechanisms and funding to support large steps (such as large land purchases), initially, and the ability to cut back (or sell land that is not needed) in the future, consistent with a "buy low and sell high" concept.
- A planning committee composed of people with varied disciplines should help implement the ERPP.
- Ensure restoration of ecological functions, including linkages between habitat types.
- Incentives for meeting standards should be both positive and negative and address landowner interests. The ecosystem manager should be accountable to the standards.
- Adaptive management should balance the need for certainty with the ability to deal with future surprises.
- Projects should be planned within a regional context to enable balancing of resource trade-offs.
- It was suggested that project developers and land owners should not be penalized if projects fall short of the stated goals.
- Adaptive management provides information; it is not an assurance.

Dick Daniel explained that a form of adaptive management is already being implemented through the Category III funded projects, and effectiveness of some of these projects will be apparent within the next five years.

The Work Group found that development of an adaptive management program can and should be done separately from developing assurances. It was suggested that assurances should be identified prior to development of the adaptive management program and that some adaptive management standards should be designed to assure implementation of the ERPP as agreed. If the standards do not provide the needed assurances, people may not reach agreement on the content of the adaptive management program.

#### Dealing with Assurance issues:

- Assurances tools include agreements, operational rules and management entities.

- The Program should assure flexibility in project funding and related regulatory authority to respond to adaptive management induced changes, such as changes in patch sizes of restoration sites.
- It was suggested that assurances are needed to ensure that money earmarked for ecosystem restoration will be spent and that identified projects will be implemented.
- It was suggested that tools, such as a new institutional arrangement, are needed to ensure achievement of long-term ERPP goals and objectives.
- The Program needs to assure adequate funding and water, a well-disciplined monitoring program, that ERPP goals are achieved with money well spent, and an implementable management structure.
- Assurance tools should allow the ecosystem manager to take risks, acquire land and coordinate project funding and planning.
- Assurances are needed to ensure long-term survivability of the fishing and farming industries.
- Assurances can provide recipients of “nasty” surprises some level of indemnity.

Roles of the Ecosystem Restoration and Assurances Work Groups were defined: ERWG should contribute to development of the adaptive management program and the Assurances Work Group role should be to assure implementation of the adaptive management program.

**Recommendations for the June Work Group meeting agenda:**

Chair Mary Selkirk led the group in a brief discussion that outlined the following agenda for the June 25 meeting.

- Review technical group membership.
- Review and discussion of peer review questions.
- Discuss lessons learned from the IEP process.
  - ~ Case study presentation on Prospect Island.